

NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE BUILDING CODE REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of Meeting

January 10, 2003

Attendance:

Tom Lambert, NH Association of Fire Chiefs
Jerry Tepe, Board of Architects, licensed architect
Tyler Carlisle, Board of Engineers, licensed electrical engineer
Bob Longchamps, NH Electrical Contractors Business Assoc., licensed master electrician
Richard Swain, NH Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors Association
Med Kopczynski, Assistant City Manager Keene, NH Municipal Association
Fred Baybutt, Assoc. General Contractors, contractor non-residential
Wes Golomb, State energy conservation code office
Tedd Evans, Board for licensing and regulation of plumbers, licensed master plumber
Mike Santa, Governors Commission on Disability
John A. Stephen, Attorney, Assistant Commissioner, Dept. of Safety
Wynn Arnold, Attorney, Department of Justice, Attorney General's office

Rep. Bob Clegg, Chairman, designee for the Department of Safety
Ken Andrews, NH Building Officials Assoc., municipal building official
Corey Landry, NH Assoc. of Fire Chiefs, sitting in for Tom Lambert, municipal fire chief
Joe Landers, NH Home Builders Association - residential

With a quorum of the Board present, acting Chairman John Stephen so declared. Notice of the meeting was posted at the Department of Safety and State House and the Legislative Office Building a minimum of 2 weeks prior to scheduled meeting date.

Adoption of Minutes:

Motion was made by Jerry Tepe to adopt the minutes of the December 13, 2002 meeting. Motion was 2nd by Med Kopczynski. There being no discussion, Acting Chairman asked for a vote. Vote was in the affirmative and so declared accepted.

Public Hearing:

The Board, at the last meeting, voted to waive the petition rules and accept at least 2 exhibits, possibly 3, that were changes to the State Building Code Review Board. The speaking procedure was outlined by the Chairman for anyone wishing to speak; the proponent of the amendment state name for the record, and the reason why this Exhibit, or proposal, or amendment is being offered; then there will be the public testimony. Any member of the public can testify.

The Board accepted a petition from a sub-committee on Height and Area modifications, which is **Exhibit 1**.

The Board accepted a proposed amendment for the NH Energy Code, which is **Exhibit 2**.

The third issue is the Plumbing Boards proposed Rules amendments and those will be taken up after **Exhibits 1 and 2**.

Jerry Tepe: Member of the Board and reporting for Ken Andrews who is Chair of the sub-committee who is out of town today. We were asked as a sub-committee to review the Height and Area Table which is in the 2000 Edition of the International Building Code. The limitations that were in the Building Code, the International Building Code, were derived initially as a conglomerate of what was in the 3 model codes, and that's where the numbers came from. What we were asked to do is to look at modifying those so that we came up with something similar to what was in BOCA 99, because the Fire Service has some concerns about some of the larger areas that were permitted in the new code. What you have before you as **Exhibit #1** is two-parts. One is revising Table 503 of the International Building Code, which is the allowable height and building areas table. This table is unique, it is not derived directly from BOCA 99, nor is it derived obviously, from the International Building Code 2000. It's a melding of the two so that the occupancies and construction types referenced in the International Building Code can be referenced appropriately to the values that were in the BOCA 99. The second part of that is a modification of Section 506, which is Area Modifications. Essentially, we are deleting that which is in the International Building Code Section 506, inserting language similar to what was in BOCA 99, for the same heights. The Committee presents this to you with a recommendation of acceptance. And I will take questions if anybody has any.

Chairman Stephen: Any Board members have questions of Mr. Tepe?

?: Jerry could you explain your thinking, as you went through the analysis, and how you came up with, with the Table?

Chairman Stephen: Board member Santa had asked the question. Just for the record, to make sure we have it on our record, whoever is asking the question, again, state your name. Thank you Mike.

Jerry Tepe: We started with BOCA 99 Table, but the occupancies are defined a little bit differently in the International Building Code as to the type of construction. For those that are familiar with it, the types of construction essentially moved up one level in what was the old 1-A type of construction, no longer exists. So it was through the work of the Committee trying to determine which values, if you will, from the BOCA 99 Table, which is what we used as our base, would then match up to the types of construction and the occupancies, as defined in the International Building Code. As I say, it's not a direct copy, because there, it's impossible to do a direct copy of the Table ones so they match up with the other editions.

Chairman Stephen: I note for the record, that Senator Clegg has appeared, and as acting Chairman, I ask him to take over the meeting.

Chairman Clegg: Thank you. Are there any questions? Mr. Tepe? Yes Sir.

Ray Cowan: Jerry, I am not quite sure in my mind yet, why you didn't just adopt what was in the Building Code. Could you just go over it again?

Jerry Tepe: There were concerns and I am sure other people that will be testifying will bring this up, but there were concerns from the Fire Service that the Table and the International Building Code, was and this a (inaudible) allowing much larger areas that had been previously allowed under the BOCA Table. As I stated earlier, this was a result of trying to meld between then existing Model Codes if anybody is interested, I can go through the process that was taken to do that. It was a lengthy process. Most of the larger values came from the western part of the country, and I am sure the Fire Service, with this question being out there can address that issue a little bit better than I can, but it was their concern that started this whole thing, and the Committee working with the Fire Services, is what we arrived at as a recommendation.

Mike Santa: I have a question. Jerry, what was the specific concerns of the Fire Service relative to the

Jerry Tepe: I think they can probably address that better, if I can defer that at least. Cause I said, their main concern was the much larger area of

buildings and the ability to fight the fires within that building. As to specifics, I think they can address that.

John Stephen: If I may, and I am only speaking on behalf of the Commissioner, and I am not speaking as a Board Member now, one of the things just the historical point is, that the Commissioner has asked this Board to provide him with recommendations of taking BOCA out of the Fire Code, but maintaining at least what the Fire Service thought was needed for public safety and fire safety. So somehow, finding a way to integrate that with the State Building Code, which is what he would like, but meeting so that the needs of the Fire Service, but he does not want the BOCA Code, because of the legislative intent, which he feels is a direction from the Legislature, in the Fire Code the way it is written. The references to BOCA has created problems with some of the Legislatures with the Fire Code which is a result of maybe even having this Board evolve. That is his mandate to this Board to find a way to meet that objective.

Chairman Clegg: Are there any other questions of Mr. Tepe? If not, thank you sir. Is there anyone else wishing to testify or give information, or speak on this issue? I am sorry, Chief?

Brian Thibeault: Thank you Senator, members of the Committee. My name is Brian Thibeault, I am representing the NH Association of Fire Chiefs. The NH Association of Fire Chiefs has been very active in the entire process of this Code coming about for the State of New Hampshire. And we had some major concerns about the issues that are here before you today. And I have to commend the sub-committee for the fine work that they have done, and it was not an easy task that they undertook. The NH Association of Fire Chiefs has reviewed the Height and Area Limitations Table that you see before you, and we are here to support the passage of these Rules. The question that came up earlier relative to what the issues were with the Height and Area Limitations, I guess to put it simply, BOCA and I know with some research, I can give you all kinds of information on that, but the BOCA 99 said that the highest occupied space in a building would be 35 feet. That is because fire engines as you see them going up and down the road everyday, with the exception of ladder trucks, the tallest ladder they have on them is 35 feet. The IBC says 40 feet. The other issues are without going through and design buildings, but looking at height and area limitations, generally these same fire engines carry 200 feet of pre-connected hose. We can generally get to where we need to get to, or the building has sprinklers, stand pipes in them, etc. etc. this allows a much greater area and we were not sure we could get to those. That is why our concerns came before the committees when they were studying the adoption of this (inaudible) and that is why we worked closely with the sub-committee in the past. So to that end, I stand here

and say that we are please and very very happy that this has come about, and I thought I would tell you that our organization supports the passage of these Rules. I will take any questions that the Chair would like.

Chairman Clegg: Are there any questions of Mr. Thibeault? Seeing none, thank you very much.

Mr. Thibeault: Thank you.

Chairman Clegg: Is there anyone who hasn't signed up who wishes to comment on this section? Sir would you come forward and state your name.

My name is Nick Cricenti, I am a licensed (inaudible) in New Hampshire.

Chairman Clegg: Excuse me sir, could you spell your last name for me?

C-R-I-C-E-N-T-I, and my area of concern is that the Board adopts these Height and Area limitations then we have towns that have adopted the IBC on their own, which they are allowed to do, and carry more strict requirements, well what we are going to have is, we won't know which Height and Area Limitations to use, because it's a definition of which is more restrictive. And we don't know what's more restrictive, its up to somebody else's interpretation, so when we are sitting down trying to design a building, if a Town has adopted the IBC as a whole, some of those Height and Areas are bigger, some are smaller. In the IBC table. So it makes it a problem for us to try and figure out which to use. I have no personal problem, if the Board adopts it, what my problem comes is, the Board has one, this town has one, another town has another one, and the playing field isn't exactly level or easy of us to figure out. To say nothing about somebody that is designing from out-of-state trying to come up with a Code. If the Board wants to adopt this, my feeling is it has to be blanketed so the towns can't change this on their own. Either more restrictive or less restrictive, and I understand they can't do less restrictive, but again, we don't know what the playing field is. It makes it difficult for us to design and makes it impossible for us to interpret what we're suppose to do and how we are suppose to do it. Part of the reason we are here is because of that confusion with the 99 code and the IBC Code, and I am not sure that this solves all that problem.

Chairman Clegg: Questions? Mr. Santa.

Mike Santa: I don't have a question for Nick, I have a question for the Board in general. I missed the last meeting, so maybe it was discussed. How are we going to handle amendments to the State Building Code with

regards to communities that have codes in place, that put them in place prior to the State Building Code being active.

Chairman Clegg: I don't want to get into that because this is a public hearing, but I will tell you, as it has always been, the State Fire Code and the State Building Code will take precedence over anything when we get into what is what isn't, more restrictive, we are going to try and define that in the upcoming technical corrections bill. Are there any questions for Mr. Cricenti? If not, thank you very much sir. Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this issue?

Med Kopczynski for the NH Municipal Association: We have heard a little testimony from the fire service as related to ability to fight fires etc. etc. with the vastly increased areas that are in the International Code, could you comment on that as a Fire Protection engineer.

Nick Cricenti: Sure. It's unquestionable that the IBC has, as it is written, in some building types and uses, has bigger areas. And also there are some more restrictive when you get up in the ones and twos. They are somewhat some more restrictive than the BOCA Code. The things that you people talk about, hose lengths, ladder lengths, those are absolutely correct. The balance it seems to me that was (inaudible) the Western Fire Chief's code, which is the UBC and the BOCA code which people use in the eastern part of the states, the way towns and cities are laid out, somewhat because they are mostly blocks and grids, anything in New England there is no blocks and grids that I know about, it makes it more difficult for use to move around and to be able to work and fight fire. So, I don't have . . . the feel is that (inaudible) the fire spot that way in the East that we have to do it because we were presented with different kind of operations makes restricting something that is reasonable and maybe making areas smaller. We could come up . . . and I did this exercise . . . I took a storage use . . . and I got to a storage use to about 60,000 square feet built out of wood.

Med Kopczynski: So as a fire protection engineer, you are supportive of this amendment.

Nick Cricenti: Sure, I don't have a big problem with it. It's more like, you know, tell us what to do, we'll be happy.

Chairman Clegg: Anyone else? Thank you sir. Sir. State your name.

Ham Rice: I am the City of Concord's Code Administrator. I guess I have a couple of observations I would like to share with the Board. #1 - this chart is effectively BOCA 99. If you take BOCA 99 chart, remove type 1A constructions, move the next 4 sections, 5 sections over, and keep type 3,

4 and 5, you have this chart. That's effectively what it is. So it is the BOCA 99 Chart, for all practical purposes. One of the things, and I guess if I say that, and I look at it, I say, well . . . we can live with it either way, although in our conversations with architects from outside of the State, they are kind of questioning where we are going. And, at this point we are in kind of a limbo. We say we don't know. We can't give you much direction. We can say, you have 2 or 3 choices, so if this issue is resolved promptly, I think it would be of assistance to everyone in the State. Truly the IBC in general, does allow greater height, greater area, but one of the things that the IBC does do, particularly in the modifiers, the sprinkler, and the access around the building modifiers, is that it encourages sprinklers, by allowing greater increase with sprinkler, and lesser increase with access around the building by saying, put a sprinkler and the sprinkler does its job. Its going to minimize the image to the building, its going to limit the spread of the fire, its going to protect people in the building, its going to protect emergency personnel that have to enter into the building. By turning the other way around, there is less of an encouragement on the sprinklers and more of an encouragement on having a road around your building. Which hopefully, here, its here in this building, the road around the building, has been plowed. In New Hampshire, that is not always true, with a lot of these building that have like access all around the building for fire fighting purposes. So I guess, I am somewhat in a quandary on how to approach that. I guess I would rather see the encouragement that emphasizes sprinklers and have a program where sprinklers are maintained, rather than have a program that admonishes the value of the sprinkler systems. I also prefer and have yet to see in any program of buildings, the structure itself is designed to minimize fire. One of the things that I think a number of communities have entertained throughout the country, and some have adopted, is a sprinkler ordinance. What that does is effectively gives very little credit in some cases, installing the sprinkler, but mandates it anyhow. What you've done then, is really given yourself a high level of protection. If a fire does break out, the sprinkler does its job, and protects the property and the people in the immediate area. But the building also does it job, and prevents the spread of fire in the structure itself. I guess one of the things, that we will probably look at and are looking at, is not only an addition to the building code, also a sprinkler ordinance, if you will, to provide an extra level of safety. But I think I would prefer to see emphasis on if you are going to adopt effectively the BOCA 99 Chart, I think I would prefer to see you not give extra emphasis on access around the building at the expense of increases allowed by sprinkler. Which is what those verbatim changes do.

Chairman Clegg: Are there any questions?

Jerry Tepe: To clarify, and that is what I had tried to say in my thing, Ham is right. It is essentially a copy of the BOCA Table. But I wanted to

emphasis you can not just look at the BOCA Table and come up with the correct numbers. As you said, there are you know we lost a construction type, or a different occupancy definitions. It is the numbers from the BOCA Table that you can just not use the BOCA Table and make it work.

Ray Cowan: What code does Concord apply now?

Ham Rice: We effectively apply the BOCA 93 Codes, but we will accept substitutions that are consistent with the (inaudible) codes. We are in the process of reviewing the IBC Code for adoption for some issues there that we may have which are minor. One of the reasons we are looking at the IBC Code is because the insurance services, ISO, is suggesting that all communities have a much more recent position of the code and ISO as I understand it, is looking to adopt this code. And a (inaudible) community and a lesser insurance charge across the board for all properties (inaudible) (someone kept banging something near mic and Ham not speaking loud enough) if you have a much more up-to-date code. I'm not sure how ISO will look at amending this, I don't see that this is an amendment that is liberal. I see this as an amendment that is stricter than what the Code (inaudible) so I would think that ISO may accept that and give (inaudible).

Chairman Clegg: Are there any other questions from the committee. Seeing none, thank you Mr. Rice. Are there any others who wish to speak on this issue? Seeing none, I will close this part and we will open up the section on. . . most of us have as Exhibit 2. PUC Energy Codes. Wes go ahead.

Wes Golomb: Good morning Senator Clegg and Committee.

Chairman Clegg: Just for the record, I am NOT Senator here.

Wes Golomb: Chairman Clegg . . .

Chairman Clegg: Thank you.

Wes Golomb: I am from the NH Public Utilities Commission, Energy Codes Office, and we sponsored the change which is summed up in Exhibit 2, to appoint the IECC Chapter 7 and 9 to the ASHRAE standard 90.1.1999 instead of the standard that is cited in the 90.1.1989. We did this for a variety of reasons. We are requesting this for a variety of reasons. First of all, the new standards 90.1.99 work reflects the current technology and building practices that are available. #2 it looks closely, and has separate sections for metal buildings, which had not been the case with the older standard. #3 it looks at and defines more realistically, when a building needs to meet the Code, including new renovation and

addition, and more importantly, when it does not need to meet the Code. Furthermore, 90.1.89 is an antiquated Code that's no longer our standards, excuse me, it's no longer supported by ASHRAE. I called and you can not even buy a book from them anymore. 99 is more flexible, if you look at the packet that I left back there, the Dept of Energy has made a determination that requires states to adopt 99 and in some of these . . . 90.1.99 is more a reality base. It requests current markets and technology and offers more flexibility and options than the older standard, and saves approximately 7% in energy consumption over the older standard. If you have any questions for me . . .

Chairman Clegg: Mr. Tepe.

Jerry Tepe: Mr. Chairman, not a question really Wes, it's just to help the Committee understand this since I was involved in the development of this and other codes when it was put together. When the final issue of the International Energy Conservation Code 2000 was put together, it was in 1999 and this standard was not available at the time that was put together. That is why it was not referenced in that Code. The newer editions of the Energy Conservation Code are referencing this standards. So I think this is an appropriate change.

Chairman Clegg: Med.

Med Kopczynski: Wes, is it fair to say if I understood your presentation and the background that the adoption of this Code will provide a more effective document and easier document for the public to use and for building departments to use and design buildings.

Wes Golomb: Yes definitely.

Med Kopczynski: Plus it saves the consumer money.

Wes Golomb: Yes.

Med Kopczynski: Thank you.

Chairman Clegg: Any other questions from the members of the Committee? If not, thank you very much.

Wes Golomb: Thank you very much.

Chairman Clegg: Is there anyone from the public wishing to comment on this section? Seeing none, I will close this section, and open the section on Proposed Amendments to the Building Code. Was that on the schedule?

Tedd Evans: It was not scheduled for public hearing.

Chairman Clegg: Then we do not want that.

Tedd Evans: I would like to make a motion, however, Mr. Chairman, to waive Rules and schedule a public hearing for this a month from now at the next meeting.

Chairman Clegg: I have to do that after I get out of public hearing.

Tedd Evans: Sorry.

Chairman Clegg: Is there anyone else that wants to or wishes to make comments on any of the issues that have been before us and subject to public hearing at this time? If not, then I close the public hearing and thank you for coming.

Now I will open up the general committee meeting and I will recognize you.

Tedd Evans: Ok. I would like to make a motion, Mr. Chair, that we waive the Rule requirements for petition and accept this for public hearing at the next meeting. On the proposed amendments to the IPC

Chairman Clegg: There is a motion to waive the requirement for filing of a petition. Is there a second? Second by Ray Cowan. Any discussion? All those in favor say I. Vote was unanimous and so declared. Public hearing will be scheduled for the next meeting.

John Stephen: Question Mr. Chairman. For public notice purposes, on this particular change, what should this be classified as? When we put our Public Notice out. Can you put that in the Record.

Tedd Evans: These are proposed amendments to the 2000 IPC, International Plumbing Code, for permanent adoption of the Plumbing Code by the Plumbing Board.

Chairman Clegg: Ok. And your changes would include installation of fuel gas distribution piping and equipment. I mean we are going to have to basically, take sections of this and tell the public what it is you are looking to change.

Tedd Evans: Taking a suggestion from one of the members format that we've used into the full paragraph format so that there would be no confusion as to what is being proposed to be amended. The actual

amendments we are asking to be included in the Code adoption. Starting on page 1 - is backup information on water temperature safety. Page 21 of the package is supporting documentation on the associated dangers of being scalded by hot water temperatures and then the competing concepts of having water temperatures too low it might support the growth of certain bacteria. On page 42 is the backup information on Legionnaires Disease and its causes. On page 71 is a short review of statistics of reported cases of Legionnaires Disease in NH.

Chairman Clegg: For the purposes of the hearing notice, the subject would be the scope of the plumbing code, the removal of the refunds, changes in violation penalties, stop work orders, as well as changes in temperatures for hot water. The rest seems like it would be contractor and I guess we should say for the record, methods of

Tedd Evans: Yes you are talking about many of these amendment have to do with filling in blank areas that are left in the Code to be filled in by the jurisdiction that is adopting, those have to do with the Title, the scope of the Code, some rulemaking authority and positions, fee schedules which do not apply to state agencies that is adopting this, has no fees associated with the permits, but we are eliminating those, we're filling in blanks with regard to violation penalties, for violating positions of the Code, or for ignoring stop work orders. And then there is more of the technical part, and fill in the blank, sewer depth, proposing some controls for water temperature, for safety purposes, proposing elimination certain types of piping materials, proposing the elimination for requirements for colored primer, or PBC piping, we are filling in the blank for the number of inches a vent must extend through a roof. We are proposing a requirement or revision for future vents in areas where it may be

Chairman Clegg: We need to sum it up Tedd. So would it be safe to say a public hearing for the Plumbers Board to change the regulations and requirements for plumbing contractors as well as non-refunding of fees?

Tedd Evans: Sounds good to me.

Chairman Clegg: Ok. Non-refundable fees should bring everybody out.

Jerry Tepe: Tedd I think from what you said before, most of these amendment s are similar to what you have done previously, under a previous plumbing code.

Tedd Evans: That is correct.

Jerry Tepe: So, I mean if you put language like that in the notice, that they are similar to existing amendments to prior codes,

Chairman Clegg: I have a problem with that looking at some of the cross outs. And not for the public notice.

Jerry Tepe: Ok that is fine.

Chairman Clegg: Anyone else? Thank you Tedd. We have two options. We can deal with the Rules amendments now and take a vote, or we can wait till next months meeting. It's up to the Board.

: I make a motion to wait until next month.

Chairman Clegg: Is there a second to that motion?

Tyler Carlisle: I second the motion.

Chairman Clegg: The motion on the floor is to hold off on the two amendments that we have heard through Public Hearing today, till next month. All in favor of that - raise your hand. Opposed. The motion fails. Is there another motion?

Wes Golomb: I would like to make a motion that we consider them now.

: Second

Chairman Clegg: All in favor raise your hand. Opposed. Ok the motion passes. Exhibit 1: Area Modifications - do I have a motion. Med.

Med Kopczynski: Question on the form of the motion. Would this be a motion to recommend to the Secretary?

Chairman Clegg: It would be a motion to accept the change to the State Building Code.

Med Kopczynski: So the motion would be to accept the changes to the State Building Code. So moved.

Chairman Clegg: Is there a second?

Tom Lambert: Second.

Chairman Clegg: Discussion. Only Exhibit 1 - which is two pages. We have to do a roll call.

Tyler Carlisle: I respect what Ham said. Proposed amendment #4 which is replacing section 506.3 with 506.3 from the BOCA Code, I believe

applies to what Mr. Rice was saying. And I am wondering if there is some possibility we might want to keep the IBC 506.3 rather than BOCA or vice versa. And I guess Jerry Tepe can answer that.

Jerry Tepe: I will tell you why we didn't do that. You would be essentially, mixing two different sets of numbers and would end up with something that nobody else in the country had ever used or ever would be using because you were taking sprinkler increases from one code and values from another code, and we'd come up with totally different numbers than anybody else in the country. That was the reason we opted to take the wholesale change rather than keeping the sprinkler increase. Did that answer your question?

Tyler Carlisle: I am not sure that it does. I am not sure which numbers you are talking about.

Jerry Tepe: Essentially the International Building Code would give you an additional 100% area increase over what the BOCA Code would have allowed you. We decided to take it as a package, the BOCA table values and the BOCA increase values.

Mike Santa: You did coordinate the use groups with the IBC.

Jerry Tepe: Yes. The use groups and the construction types are from the IBC. The numbers are from the BOCA Table, and the area modification formula numbers are from the BOCA. Sprinkler increases and the frontage increases are as calculated under the BOCA Code.

Chairman Clegg: Any other discussion. Seeing none, I will take the roll call.

Jerry Tepe: In favor

Ray Cowan: In favor

William Smagula: In favor

Tyler Carlisle: In favor

Medard Kopczynski: In favor

Thomas Lambert: In favor

Frederick Baybutt: In favor

Wes Golomb: In favor

Tedd Evans: In favor

Richard Swain: In favor

Robert Longchamps: In favor

Michael Santa: In favor

Chair: votes yes

It is unanimous. As you know the Rule will stay in effect for 2 years.

Exhibit 2: Proposed change to the NH Energy Code. May I have a motion.

:Motion is that this change be accepted by the Board.

Jerry Tepe: Second.

Chairman Clegg: Any discussion.

: Yes Mr. Chairman. There is one very important feature was not mentioned regarding improved efficiency of this (inaudible) and that is the secondary benefit to air quality in the State. Not only efficiency where the consumer will pay less, but it will improve air quality.

Chairman Clegg: Any other discussion? We will have a roll call.

Mike Santa: In favor

Bob Longchamps: In favor

Richard Swain: In favor

Tedd Evans: In favor

Wes Golomb: In favor

Fred Baybutt: In favor

Chief Lambert: In favor

Med Kopczynski: In favor

Tyler Carlisle: In favor

William Smagula: In favor

Jerry Tepe: In favor

Chair: Votes yes

Chairman called the vote unanimous. Those changes will be made.

Chairman Clegg: Is there any other business to come before the Board?

Jerry Tepe: The Height and Area Tables that were just approved are available on the AIA NH website and the AGC NH website, for anybody that wants to download them.

Judicial Training Program: Just a reminder that it is scheduled for the 14th.

NEXT MEETING: Moved to the 21st.

Chairman Clegg accepted a motion to adjourn, and duly seconded, so declared this meeting adjourned.

Reminder:

The next Board meeting will be on February 21st, 2003. The future meeting will be as follows:

March - 14th
April - 11th
May - 9th
June - 13th
July - 11th
August - 8th
September - 12th
October - 10th
November - 14th
December - 12th